

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending in the application and currently stand rejected. Entry of the present amendment and further examination of the present application in view of the following remarks is hereby requested.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-26 and 29-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508) in view of Carden (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0039592). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this ground of rejection.

Applicants submit that Agraharam fails to teach or suggest at least “in response to a request for a user-specific website, the request including at least one phone number associated with the request, effect a claim to the user-specific website based on verification of the at least one phone number” as recited in amended claim 1.

Agraharam is generally directed to providing e-mail connectivity on a telephone network (see Agraharam, Abstract). Agraharam, at column 6, lines 45-48 (cited by the Examiner in the Office Action), states that “[t]he IVR system detects the phone number of the calling party ... and verifies that the telephone number and the PIN match, and then activates the alias mechanism.” Agraharam thus discloses verifying a request for email aliasing using a PIN. However, Agraharam does not teach “effect a claim to the user-specific website based on verification of the at least one phone number” as recited in claim 1.

Carden does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Agraharam. Carden (see Abstract and paragraph 20) merely discloses assigning a web address that includes a telephone number in the actual web address. Carden does not disclose “in response to a request for a user-specific website, the request including at least one phone number associated with the request, effect a claim to the user-specific website based on verification of the at least one phone number” as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Agraharam and Carden, separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features of amended claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and claims 2-7 which depend on claim 1, is respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: **FC-0006
Application No.: 09/728,107
Office Action Dated: February 15, 2011

PATENT

Each of independent claims 8, 15, 20, 25, and 29 recite similar features as claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8, 15, 20, 25, and 29, and claims 9-14, 16-19, 21-24, 26, and 30, which depend on independent claims 8, 15, 20, 25, and 29, is respectfully requested.

Claims 27-28 and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam and Carden in view of PTO-asserted well known in the art. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this ground of rejection.

Claims 27-28 and 31-32 depend from independent claims 25 and 29, respectively. As discussed above, Agraharam and Carden fail to show or suggest at least the features of amended claims 25 and 29. For at least this reason, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27-28 and 31-32 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all pending claims. Should the examiner have any further suggestions for expediting the prosecution of the presently pending claims, the undersigned respectfully asks the examiner contact him at **206-903-2474**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 10, 2011

/Han Gim/
Han Gim
Registration No. 62,953

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439